

REMARKS

This Amendment, filed in reply to the Office Action dated January 11, 2007, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of objection and rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

By this Amendment, Applicant amends claims 1-6, and adds claims 7-9. Therefore, claims 1-9 are all the claims pending in the application.

Information Disclosure Statement

The Examiner indicates that the information disclosure statement filed February 1, 2006 is being considered. However, the references 8-241338, 11-120000, 2002-318891, 2003-296383 have not been considered because the translation was allegedly not submitted.

With regard to the concise explanation of relevance for non-English language information, MPEP 609.04(a)III provides the following:

Where the information listed is not in the English language, but was cited in a search report or other action by a foreign patent office in a counterpart foreign application, the requirement for a concise explanation of relevance can be satisfied by submitting an English-language version of the search report or action which indicates the degree of relevance found by the foreign office.

In the present application, the references 8-241338, 11-120000, 2002-318891, 2003-296383 were cited in the international search report, and an English translation of the international search report which indicates the degree of relevance was filed February 1, 2006. Therefore, the requirement for a concise explanation of relevance for those references have been satisfied. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner consider the above-mentioned references.

Claim Objections

Claims 1-6 are objected to because of minor informalities.

Claims 1-6 have been amended to improve clarity and readability.

With regard to claims 1, 3 and 5, the recitations of “good” are removed.

With regard to claim 1, the design requirement particulars are described as being with respect to a design of the product required by a customer or a designer; whereas, the designer discretion particulars are described as being by discretion of the designer with respect to the design of the product. Therefore, the differences between the design requirement particulars and the designer discretion particulars are clearly described in claim 1.

The comments in the immediately preceding paragraph are respectfully submitted with substantially equal force, by analogy, to claims 3 and 5 in view of the similarities of claims 1, 3 and 5.

With regard to claim 3, a design rule is described as necessary for design of a product targeted for automated design; whereas, a determination rule is described as including a rule to be satisfied by design of the product in the case of manufacturing the product. Therefore, the differences between the previously storing a design rule and the previously storing a determination rule are clearly described in claim 3.

The comments in the immediately preceding paragraph are respectfully submitted with substantially equal force, by analogy, to claim 5 in view of the similarities of claims 3 and 5.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests that the objections be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-6 have been amended to improve clarity. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because they are non-statutory.

Claims 5-6 have been amended. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be withdrawn

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Li (U.S. Patent No. 6,915,252, hereinafter “Li”). Applicant traverses the anticipation rejections as follows.

The Examiner seems to rely upon the verification tool as disclosing the design result determination means. See Office Action, page 5, first paragraph.

In Li, the verification tool uses its drc (design rule check) design rules to verify if a physical design meets each of the design rule. Col. 7, lines, 52-54. On the contrary, claim 1 describes a design result determination means for determining whether a design result obtained by the automated design means satisfies the determination rule, which is to be satisfied by design of the product in the case of manufacturing the product, and is in addition to the requirement particulars, the designer discretion particulars and the design rule. Li fails to teach or suggest a

verification tool which verifies if a design meets rules that are in addition to design rules. At least for this reason, claim 1 should be patentable.

The foregoing comments are respectfully submitted to apply with substantially equal force, by analogy, to this rejection of claims 3 and 5 in view of the similarities between claims 1, 3 and 5. Claims 2, 4 and 6 are patentable at least because of their respective dependencies.

New Claims

Claims 7-9 are added to describe the invention more particularly.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kelly G. Hyndman 39,234/
Kelly G. Hyndman
Registration No. 39,234

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/265550

65565
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 11, 2007